REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 30, 2003. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-12, 15, 16, 19-23, 26, 27, and 30-33 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23, and 27, the only claims in independent form, have been amended for clarification purposes and not to overcome any of the rejections discussed below. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 5, 8-11, 16, 19-22, 27, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as "failing to comply with the written description requirement." In particular, it is alleged that the associating means or step of independent Claims 5, 16, and 27 is not supported by an adequate written description.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and directs the Examiner's attention to the specification at, for example, page 15, lines 17-19; page 16, lines 12-14; item 24 of Fig. 2; and the corresponding description of item 24. More specifically, a function indicating a relation between a document display magnification and an object display size is defined for each object, and an object may be selected and a function thereof, such as size information, may be changed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 5, 16, and 27, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are supported by an adequate written description, and therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 4, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,896,470 (Miyaza); that Claims 23 and 26 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaza; and that Claims 5, 8, 11, 16,

19, 22, 27, 30, and 33 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaza in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,136,399 (Aoyama). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that independent Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23, and 27, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

An aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that includes area size determining means, information memory means, object size determining means, size changing means, and control means. The area size determining means determines a size of a document output area when document data is outputted to an output apparatus based on layout information. The information memory means stores a plurality of size information having a relation between a size of a document output area and a size of each of plural kinds of objects included in the document data. The plural kinds of objects include characters and objects other than characters. The object size determining means determines a size of each of the plural kinds of objects based on the size determined by the area size determining means and the size information stored in the information memory means. The size changing means changes the size of each of the plural kinds of objects based on each size determined by the object size determining means, respectively. The control means outputs each of the plural kinds of objects whose size has been changed by the size changing means to the output apparatus.

One of the notable features of Claim 1 is that the information processing apparatus changes a size of each object included in the document data, including character objects and non-character objects, based on an object size of each object, which is determined

according to the determined size of the document output area. By virtue of this feature, for example, character objects and non-character objects, such as images and diagrams, may have their sizes changed.[1]

Miyaza relates to an image processing system that provides an "improved readability of characters." As understood by Applicant, Miyaza discloses that a copier will not reduce a character size if the reduction would render the character unreadable.

Nothing has been found in Miyaza that is believed to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that includes "information memory means for storing a plurality of size information having a relation between a size of a document output area and a size of each of plural kinds of objects included in the document data, *wherein the plural kinds of objects include characters and objects other than characters*," and "object size determining means for determining a size of each of the plural kinds of objects based on the size determined by said area size determining means and the size information stored in said information memory means," and "size changing means for changing the size of each of the plural kinds of objects based on each size determined by said object size determining means, respectively," as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Miyaza is understood to provide a way to deal with readability issues with respect to characters that undergo reduction processing by a copier. Applicant respectfully submits that Miyaza is silent regarding altering the size of non-character objects.

---

[1] The examples provided herein are intended for illustrative purposes. The scope of the claims are not to be limited in any way by the illustrative examples.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Miyaza, and therefore withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested. Independent Claims 12 and 23 include a feature similar to that discussed above, in which the size of each of plural kinds of objects, including characters and objects other than characters, is changed based on a size determined for each object, respectively. Therefore, Claims 12 and 23 also are believed to be patentable for at least the above reasons.

An aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 5 is directed to an information processing apparatus that includes layout information memory means, display control means, and associating means. The layout information memory means stores layout information when document data is outputted to an output apparatus. The display control means displays two or more kinds of objects included in the document data on a display screen. The two or more kinds of objects include characters and objects other than characters. The associating means associates each displayed object with size information having a relation between a size of a document output area and a size of a displayed object when the document data is outputted to the output apparatus based on the layout information.

Aoyama relates to an image recording system with editing functions. As understood by Applicant, Aoyama discloses that the system colors a designated area of an original image that has been read.

Applicant submits that a combination of Miyaza and Aoyama, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that includes "display control means for displaying two or more kinds of objects

included in the document data on a display screen, wherein the two or more kinds of objects include characters and objects other than characters," and "associating means for associating each displayed object with size information having a relation between a size of a document output area and a size of a displayed object when the document data is outputted to the output apparatus based on the layout information, "as recited in Claim 5.

As discussed above in connection with Claim 1, Miyaza is understood to provide a way to deal with readability issues with respect to characters that undergo reduction processing by a copier. Applicant submits that Miyaza is silent regarding utilizing the size of non-character objects. Applicant further submits that Aoyama fails to remedy the deficiencies of Miyaza. Although Aoyama discusses setting a magnification, the magnification that is set is described in the context of a copy and not in the context of character and non-character objects included in document data, as claimed in Claim 5.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 5 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claims 16 and 27 include features similar to those of Claim 5 and therefore are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons presented above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the above reasons. Nevertheless, because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

The present Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance. Therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and is respectfully requested, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of this application.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant
Lock Lee W. Jaynes
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 399560v1